

Proposal Reviews

#215: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Final Selection Panel Review

Initial Selection Panel Review

Environmental Education Technical Review

Bay Regional Review

Delta Regional Review

San Joaquin Regional Review

Sacramento Regional Review

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding

Environmental Compliance

Budget

Final Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Final Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 215

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Fund	
As Is	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$179,783**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

None

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

The Clean Estuary Project's comment endorsing the value to the Bay region from funding of this proposal.

Initial Selection Panel Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Initial Selection Panel Review

Proposal Number: 215

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

Please provide an overall evaluation rating.

Explanation of Recommendation Categories: Fund

- **As Is** (a proposal recommended for funding as proposed)
- **In Part** (a proposal for which partial funding is recommended for selected project phases or components)
- **With Conditions** (a proposal for which funds are recommended if the applicant contractually agrees to meet the specified conditions)

Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan (a proposal addressing a high priority action that requires some revision followed by additional review prior to being recommended for funding)

Not Recommended (a proposal not currently recommended for funding-after revision may be considered in the future)

Note on "Amount":

For proposals recommended as Fund As Is, Fund In Part or Fund With Conditions, the dollar amount is the amount recommended by the Selection Panel.

For proposals recommended as Consider as Directed Action in Annual Workplan, the dollar amount is the amount requested by the applicant(s).

Fund	
As Is	X
In Part	-
With Conditions	-
Consider as Directed Action	-
Not Recommended	-

Amount: **\$179,783**

Conditions, if any, of approval (if there are no conditions, please put "None"):

none

Provide a brief explanation of your rating:

Prior work undertaken by applicant in Phase 1 (production of website and brochure) has been successful. The proposed project will: a) target industries that sell/distribute exotic species to the public/other industries and educate them about the potential impacts of the introduction and spread of those species in the environment through workshops, industry magazine ads and articles, best management practices manuals, enhancement of existing website, and b) target the general public about same through commercial airplane video. These tasks will occur over a two year period. This type of integrated outreach and education effort will compliment other efforts underway to reduce introduction of exotic species through ballast water exchange. The applicant will coordinate efforts with state and federal agencies and groups involved in local conservation, public interest, and outreach to enhance success. The panel encourages the applicants to include CDFG enforcement division in this coordination. CDFG has an invasive species coordinator.

One drawback appears to be the need to produce media products in additional languages such as Vietnamese, Spanish, and Hmong). If applicant would require additional funds to produce products in languages other than those identified in the proposal then the applicant should come back to CALFED in a future PSP round to request those funds.

Environmental Education Technical Review:

CALFED Bay-Delta 2002 ERP PSP Environmental Education Technical Review Form

Proposal Number: 215

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

Review:

Please provide an overall evaluation summary rating:

Superior: outstanding in all respects;

Above Average: Quality proposal, medium or high regional value, and no significant administrative concerns;

Adequate: No serious deficiencies, no significant regional impediments, and no significant administrative concerns;

Not Recommended: Serious deficiencies, significant regional impediments or significant administrative concerns.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating
XSuperior	This is a very strong, well written proposal. It is a good continuation of Phase 1. It would have been nice to have the web site and the brochure that was done previously to review. Comments indicate it may be difficult to get air time for the video on commercial flights. This approach or another needs verification. Regarding the video, the review team felt that Hmong and Vietnamese tend to be the consumers for some of the audiences this project is targeting. Verification of a Chinese translated video as the target audience to try to reach first is recommended
-Above average	
-Adequate	
-Not recommended	

1. **Clearly stated educational goals, objectives and expected outcomes.** Are the project's educational goals, objectives, and outcomes clearly stated? Is its target audience important because of its size, diversity, location, or influence? Will it broaden understanding about restoring the Bay-Delta ecosystem? Will it change behaviors that affect Bay-Delta restoration?

The project and its goals are clearly stated. Target Audience is important to this issue, and would lead to better understanding and be given direct ways they could change their behaviors to help the problem

2. **Justification (including conceptual model, likelihood of success).** Does the conceptual model satisfactorily explain how the project will attain its goals? Is it supported by research or past results?

This project explains the basis for their hypothesis and presents some past results from Phase 1. There is also a feedback loop incorporated.

3. **Approach (including appropriate curriculum for target audience).** Does the project appropriately integrate activities (curricula, equipment, field activities, audiovisual communications, earned coverage in news media, etc)? Are its materials and activities appropriate to its audience? Can it be implemented readily by teachers and other participants?

This project has an integrated approach and will be available for education of industries, general public and employee and consumers of the industry. It can be readily implemented and used by others including teachers.

4. **Linkages and compatibility to existing school, community and stewardship programs (fits into existing curricula, demonstrated learning value).** Is the project satisfactorily integrated with ecosystem restoration partnerships or community programs? For K-12 projects, is the project adequately aligned with the California state Educational Frameworks or other mandatory teaching standards? Does it make full use of suitable existing curricula and facilities?

This particular project is not targeted towards the school systems.

5. **Replicability and dissemination of the program or project.** Can the project be replicated, if successful? Are there satisfactory plans for sharing project materials and results with others?

This could be easily replicated and there are plans for broad dissemination.

6. **Pre- and post-project evaluation component.** Are the evaluation methods effective and appropriate to the project?

The evaluation methods seem effective and appropriate.

7. **Capabilities (qualifications and infrastructure).** Is the project staff, including consultants and subcontractors, qualified? Is the project adequately supported by existing educational infrastructure? Will it develop the leadership, partnerships, and financial support to sustain it over the long term? Does the proposal incorporate adequate steps to assure that the project can be sustained after CALFED's funds are expended?

This project has qualified staff and it develops critical partnerships within the industry its trying to reach. Who would maintain the web site after the grant is unclear.

8. **Cost/benefit.** Is the budget reasonable and adequate for the work proposed?

Budget is reasonable and adequate.

9. **Regional Review.** How did the regional panel(s) rank the proposal (High, Medium, Low)? Did the regional panel(s) identify significant benefits (regional priorities, linkages with other activities, local involvement) or impediments (local constraints, conflicts with other activities, lack of local involvement) to this proposal? What were they?

Bay medium; good, but not essential Delta medium; not essential San Joaquin high; could have more emphasis on SJ, and also have Spanish, Vietnamese, and Hmong languages Sacramento high; well written, cost effective, good track record

10. **Administrative Review.** Were there significant concerns about the proposal with regard to the prior performance, environmental compliance and budget administrative reviews? What were they?

Prior Performance recommended for approval Compliance good Budget good; proposal amt. Included fed. Overhead rate

Miscellaneous comments:

Bay Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 215

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

Overall Ranking: -Low **XMedium** -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This is a good but not essential project. See notes below

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

-Yes **XNo**

How?

The video production and distribution components do not appear to be feasible within the proposed budget, but other components appear feasible.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

Specific, targeted outreach efforts to affect further spread of invasive species is a reasonable match with CALFED priorities)MR-1;BR-3).

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

x

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

-Yes **XNo**

How?

The panel has concerns that the industry outreach priorities may be inadequate or ineffective. The need to address invasive plant introductions through the seed and nursery trade is at least as great as that of the exotic animal trade, but these local institutions are not adequately addressed.

Other Comments:

x

Delta Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 215

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

Overall Ranking: -Low ☒Medium -High

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This is solid application, bit isn't essential.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

☒Yes -No

How?

o The intent of this proposal is to educate the public to avoid particular on practices that could result in the introduction of non-native invasive species. This proposal is a follow up to an earlier phase 1 CALFED effort. Some of the work (i.e. web-page) will continue in an expanded role. The experience from the previous project is directly applicable to this project.

o Seven tasks will be performed over a two-year period, including the conduct of two workshops, preparation of best management practices manuals, development of a color poster, development of industry magazine and website ads and articles, development of short video segments, enhancement of the existing website and development of quarterly progress reports to CALFED. The work schedule for these tasks appears reasonable.

o No CEQA or NEPA documents will be required to complete the proposal.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

☒Yes -No

How?

o This proposal is consistent with Goal I of the Strategic Plan for Non-Native Invasive Species.

o This proposal is consistent with ERP Draft Stage 1 Delta and Eastside Tributaries Region Restoration Priority # 5 (control NIS) and Multi-Regional restoration priorities #1 (Prevent NS establishment) and 3 (Implement environmental education actions).

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

☒Yes -No

How?

o This proposal is identified as Aphase 2'', as a follow up to an earlier CALFED-funded proposal, Reducing the Risk of Importation and Distribution of Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education (99-F06).

o The practices and prevention strategies that will be distributed through this project can have widespread benefits if implemented.

o The focus of this proposal is on non-ballast water strategies and measures, since those are adequately being addressed in a Sea Grant-funded activity, West Coast Ballast Outreach Project, based in Oakland. Consequently, this project will complement that activity.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

o Six of the seven tasks to be performed in this proposal are directed at the local public (Task 7 requires quarterly progress reports to be submitted to CALFED.)

o The video segment will be prepared in both English and Chinese languages.

o Local industries and public audiences will be targeted to receive the information developed in this proposal.

o Local industry and trade organization groups, State and Federal government agencies, and local conservation, public interest and outreach groups involved in the earlier phase 1 project will be involved in this project also.

Other Comments:

X

San Joaquin Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 215

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

The committee ranked this proposal as having a high priority for the San Joaquin region. This proposal addresses the needs for preventing non-native invasive species from becoming established by educating the public about the damages caused by these organisms on the local ecosystems.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

Project is educational in its approach and already has numerous links to business and stakeholder groups that are involved or affected by introduction of non-native species. No permits are required to complete this project, nor is the access or purchase of land required to complete this project.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

The project is applicable to several regional and CALFED Strategic Goals. Strategic Goals #5 (non-native invasive species), Multi regional #'s 1 and 3, (prevent and reduce the impacts of non-native invasive species, implement educational actions), Sacramento region #5, (implement actions to prevent, control, reduce impacts of non-native species), Delta region #5 (implement actions to prevent, control, reduce impacts of non-native species), Bay region #3 (implement actions to prevent, control, reduce impacts of non-native species). Although the San Joaquin regional goals direct action against the purple loosestrife invasion, the region is also susceptible to other invasive species and the project intends to educate the public about new introductions and how to properly dispose of exotic species that they may already have.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

Project complements previous Phase 1 project, "Reducing the Risk of Importation and Distribution of Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education" and the West Coast Ballast Outreach Project (WCBOP) as well as many ongoing restoration projects through out the Bay and Delta regions. Other regional areas will benefit through the multi-media educational avenues that the project intends to produce.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

Project leader already has numerous ties to industry, state, federal, and academic institutions and local stakeholder groups. Production of BMP's and workshops for industry and the public will be implemented.

Other Comments:

Proposal would be stronger if more emphasis was placed on the San Joaquin region, but aquatic invasive species are of interest to the region. Also, the projects should include spanish, vietnamese, and maybe Hmong language versions of the multi-media productions to cover a larger proportion of the population.

Sacramento Regional Review:

Proposal Number: 215

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

Overall Ranking: -Low -Medium **XHigh**

Provide a brief summary explanation of the committee's ranking:

This well-written proposal should be very high priority for funding. The concept is exceptionally cost-effective and has a good track record. \$90K/year is a minimal investment relative to the cost of addressing new species introduction. UCD is well-qualified to carry out this work. The panel had no reservations about this proposal.

1. Is the project feasible based on local constraints?

XYes -No

How?

This is Phase 2 of an ongoing project with a proven track record.

2. Does the project pursue the restoration priorities applicable to the region as outlined in the PSP?

XYes -No

How?

This is one of the PSP Restoration Priorities for Multi-Region Bay-Delta Areas: 1. Prevent the establishment of additional non-native species and reduce the negative biological, economic, and social impacts of established nonnative species in the Bay-Delta estuary and its watersheds.

3. Is the project adequately linked with other restoration activities in the region, such as ongoing implementation projects and regional planning efforts?

XYes -No

How?

This is an ongoing project by UC Extension with superior links with an impressive array of State and Federal Agencies, public interest, industry and trade organizations.

4. Does the project adequately involve local people and institutions?

XYes -No

How?

This a proven public education project has superior linkages, providing outreach to local conservation, public interest and outreach groups.

Other Comments:

Prior Performance/Next Phase Funding:

New Proposal Number: 215

New Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

1. Prior CALFED project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*

99-F06 Reducing the Importation and Distribution of Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education.

2. Prior CVPIA project numbers, titles, and programs: *(list only projects for which you are the contract manager)*
3. Have negotiations about contracts or contract amendments with this applicant proceeded smoothly, without persistent difficulties related to standard contract terms and conditions?

-Yes ☒No ☐-N/A

If no, please explain any difficulties:

Initial negotiations proceeded smoothly until concern was raised over the Rights and Data clause used in the standard CALFED agreement language. Long negotiations ensued with a University of California attorney and the State Attorney. Eventually language was developed that was agreeable to all. My understanding is that now this language can be used for all CALFED projects without delays in agreement negotiations.

4. Are the status, progress, and accomplishments of the applicant's current CALFED or CVPIA project(s) accurately stated?

☒Yes ☐-No ☐-N/A

If no, please explain any inaccuracies:

5. Is the applicant's progress towards these project(s)' milestones and outcomes to date satisfactory?

☒Yes ☐-No ☐-N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

6. Is the applicant's reporting, records keeping, and financial management of these projects satisfactory?

☒Yes ☐-No ☐-N/A

If no, please explain deficiencies:

7. Will the project(s) be ready for next phase funding in 2002, based on its current progress and expenditure rates?

☒Yes -No -N/A

If no, please explain:

Other Comments:

00-F11 has been a great success and has received accolades from industry and public representatives alike. They are making good progress addressing the many issues of NIS introductions and pathways. The applicants have demonstrated responsible and dedicated implementation of this project in a professional and timely manner. I would recommend the next phase be approved as proposed.

Environmental Compliance:

Proposal Number: 215

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

1. Are the legal or regulatory issues that affect the proposal identified adequately in the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the project's timeline and budget reflect adequate planning to address legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal?

☒Yes ☐No

If no, please explain:

3. Do the legal and regulatory issues that affect the proposal significantly impair the project's feasibility?

☐Yes ☒No

If yes, please explain:

Other Comments:

Budget:

Proposal Number: 215

Applicant Organization: University of California, Davis, Department of Environmental Science & Policy

Proposal Title: Reducing the Introduction and Damage of Aquatic Nonindigenous Species through Outreach and Education, Phase 2

1. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each year of requested support?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

2. Does the proposal include a detailed budget for each task identified?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

3. Does the proposal clearly state the type of expenses encompassed in indirect rates or overhead costs?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

4. Are appropriate project management costs clearly identified?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

5. Do the total funds requested (Form I, Question 17A) equal the combined total annual costs in the budget summary?

XYes -No

If no, please explain (for example, are costs to be reimbursed by cost share funds included in the budget summary).

6. Does the budget justification adequately explain major expenses?

XYes -No

If no, please explain:

7. Are there other budget issues that warrant consideration?

☒ Yes ☐ No

If yes, please explain:

Proposed Amount included Federal overhead rate.

Other Comments: